

21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

21st CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



Applicant Name:	Culver Community School Corporation
Proposal Ranking:	60
Average Score	53.1 / 125

Proposal Strengths:

- The program will provide transportation from school to the site and home after programming.
- The applicant demonstrated need of an enhanced OST program in Culver, Indiana. - There was a good amount of data included – usage was appropriate, both visually shown and textually explained. -Great mention of the origin of the partnership between the Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Northwest Indiana, Inc., Culver Community Schools/Culver Community Youth Center. -Thorough MOU's created in clear descriptions of what each party will be responsible for within the context of the grant period. -Significant amount of partnerships secured – showed great community involvement and interest in providing better outcomes for economically disadvantaged youth in Marshall County. -Significant investment in progressive software/database utilized (NWEA) to measure academic performance. It was great to see written explanation of the data as opposed to just including graphs of data. -Great decision to double-space the text so it is easier to read. -Great to see the school and community so invested in creating a better program and space for a varying age group of kids.
- The application items were in the correct order, and some sections offered good ideas.

Proposal Weaknesses:

- The application is not well developed and lacks details and cohesiveness. The program design/implementation did not include sufficient information to describe a plan that included specific outcomes to be accomplished based on multiple data sources.
- Overall, this application lacked clarity and flow in relation to a well-thought out program design, appropriately allocated funds and thoroughly addressing the priority area of Social Emotional Learning. There were not enough details included that demonstrated a succinct and clear program for K-12 students. The application did not mention the high school students to be served, their academic enrichment or behavioral adjustments related to Social Emotional Learning. The applicant included an MOU at the beginning for Four County as a clinical service provider to employ Mental Health Clinicians as well as an Indiana Licensed Mental Health Therapist to provide therapeutic services to CCSC students. This was not mentioned anywhere in the narrative on how they would administer their services in their program. This component would have significantly bolstered the application in relation to their chosen priority area of Social Emotional Learning. -The applicant mentions an advisory board in the MOU's but not anywhere in the narrative. -Applicant needed to provide a better explanation of NWEA MAP Growth in relation to their school system. Outside research was required to fully

21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

21st CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



understand what was discussed in this section. A note of caution to the applicant: acronym's must always be spelled out and explained. The writer should never assume their reader knows all they know and provide clarity throughout. -The application did not speak thoroughly to family engagement. -There was no clear definition of how or when the current OST program operates. Both Summer and School Year hours were mentioned in the narrative. -Applicant lost significant points in several of the sections for lack of information and required tables/templates and guidelines. -Often information was included in sections that would have been beneficial in sections, referring back to necessity of clarity and flow. -Also, it did not appear that there was a significant editing process completed with this application. As a result, there were consistent grammatical and sentence structure issues.

- The application overall lacked a display of time and forethought. There were many components that seemed repetitive, and lacked focus on the priority area of the program. The application came across as broad and vague. The application would of benefited from having other collaborators help in the process.

Top Areas Where Points Were Lost:

- Program Design
- Evidence of Previous Success
- Program Implementation
- Evaluation
- Program Communication
- Budget
- Partnerships